

IN THE REMARKS

In the present amendment, Applicants have amended Figs. 10-14 of the drawings in order to correct for the labeling on the various graphs and charts. Specifically, the units for the tension of the web was incorrectly labeled as being N/m^2 . The drawings have been amended in order to show the proper units for the tension, specifically N/m . Applicants respectfully submit that these changes do not inject new matter into the application as the correct units for the tension were shown, for instance, in Figs. 8 and 9 of the drawings.

Applicants have also amended various portions of the specification in order to provide for the correct unit labeling of the tension. Specifically, the words "Newtons per meter squared" have been changed to "Newtons per meter". Applicants respectfully submit that these changes do not inject new matter into the present application.

In the Office Action of August 28, 2003, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Luukkala et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,833,928).

Additionally, claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luukkala et al. in view of Nakaoka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,251,491).

Also in the Office Action of August 28, 2003, claims 4-7 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In the present amendment, Applicants have rewritten claims 4 and 7 in independent form to incorporate all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims from which they depend. Claims 4 and 7 are thus allowable. Claims 5 and 6 depend either directly

or indirectly from claim 4. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 4-7 are in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully traverse the § 102(b) rejection to claim 1 in view of Luukkala et al. Respectfully, Luukkala et al. does not disclose an apparatus that has an air pulse mechanism for applying a pulse of fluid to a web to create a wave in the web.

Throughout Luukkala et al., the device described to generate a membrane wave 2 on the paper web 1 is described as being a loud speaker 3 (see Luukkala et al. at column 4, lines 32-33, 45-46, and 54-55). Luukkala et al. does state that other sound sources which generate frequencies between 100 and 500 Hz may also be used (see Luukkala et al. at column 5, lines 25-27). Further, Luukkala et al. states that the sound source could be either a loud speaker, a compressed air whistle pipe, or the equivalent (see Luukkala et al. at column 5, lines 23-25). A compressed air whistle pipe is a whistle that is dependent for operation on compressed air. Applicants respectfully submit that the compressed air whistle pipe disclosed in column 5 of Luukkala et al. does not induce a wave 2 on the web 1 by way of shooting air onto the web 1, but instead causes a wave brought about by sound vibrations due to the blowing of the compressed air whistle pipe.

Additionally, Luukkala et al. states that the compressed air whistle pipe is one type of object that may be used as the “sound source” (see Luukkala et al. at column 5, lines 23-25). Nowhere does Luukkala et al. disclose a device in which a pulse of fluid is applied to the web in order to create a wave in the web. In fact, Luukkala et al. specifically states that tension measurement apparatuses which blow air onto the web in order to create a wave or dent in the web are not preferable (see Luukkala et al. at

column 1, lines 62-65). Luukkala et al. specifically states that blowing air onto the web is undesirable in that there is a possibility of tearing the web due to the blowing of air directly thereon (see Luukkala et al. at column 1, lines 62-65).

Luukkala et al. only discloses a sonic method and apparatus of generating a wave on a web. Claim 1 calls for an air pulse for applying a pulse of fluid to the web to create a wave in the web. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 defines over Luukkala et al. and is in condition for allowance. Further, all claims which depend from claim 1 (claims 2 and 3) are also in condition for allowance. Their rejections being made moot due to the allowance of claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable action thereon is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the Examiner's convenience in order to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

DORITY & MANNING,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW, P.A.

Date: October 2, 2003

Neal P. Pierotti

Neal P. Pierotti
Registration No. 45,716

Post Office Box 1449
Greenville, South Carolina 29602 USA
Telephone: 864-271-1592
Facsimile: 864-233-7342